March 15, 1996
5000.1

SUBJECT: Defense Acquisition

References: (a) DoD Directive 5000.1, “Defense Acquisition,” February 23, 1991 (hereby canceled).
(b) DoD Directive 8120.1, “Life-Cycle Management of Automated Information Systems,” January 14, 1993 (hereby canceled).
(c) DoD 5000.2-R, “Mandatory Procedures for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Automated Information Systems, 1996
(d) Office of Management and Budget Circular A-109, “Major Systems Acquisitions,” April 1976
(e) through (ggg), see enclosures 1 and 2

A. PURPOSE

This Directive:

1. States policies and principles for all DoD acquisition programs and identifies the Department’s key acquisition officials and forums.

2. Replaces DoD Directive 5000.1, “Defense Acquisition,” February 23, 1991 (reference (a)) and DoD Directive 8120.1, “Life-Cycle Management of Automated Information Systems,” January 14, 1993 (reference (b)).

3. Authorizes publication of DoD 5000.2-R, “Mandatory Procedures for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Automated Information Systems” (reference (c)).

4. In accordance with OMB Circular A-109 (reference (d)), establishes a disciplined yet flexible management approach for acquiring quality products that satisfy the operational user’s needs.

5. Cancels the documents identified at Enclosure 2. These cancellations will be replaced by DoD 5000.2-R, “Mandatory Procedures for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Automated Information Systems” (reference (c)).

B. APPLICABILITY and SCOPE

This Directive applies to all elements of the DoD. This includes the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Unified Combatant Commands, the Defense Agencies, and DoD Field Activities (hereafter referred to collectively as "DoD Components"). This Directive and 5000.2-R (reference (c)) rank first and second in order of precedence for providing mandatory policies and procedures

for the management of acquisition programs, except when statutory requirements override. If there is any conflicting guidance pertaining to contracting, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and/or Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement shall take precedence over this Directive and DoD Regulation 5000.2-R (reference (c)).

This Directive describes broad management principles that are applicable to all DoD acquisition programs. Highly sensitive classified programs, cryptologic, and intelligence programs, shall follow the guidance contained in this Directive. DoD 5000.2-R (reference (c)) describes operating procedures that are mandatory only for Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAPs), Major Automated Information System (MAIS) acquisition programs, and for other acquisition programs as specifically stated in the Instruction. DoDD 8000.1 (reference (e)) describes management principles that are mandatory for all information management activities, including those related to acquisition of information systems, resources, services, and infrastructures.

Providing quality products needed by the United States Armed Forces requires a highly disciplined, yet flexible management framework that effectively translates operational needs into stable, affordable acquisition programs. The policies and principles stated in this Directive are intended to serve as broad guidelines for acquisition personnel throughout the DoD. The accompanying document, DoD 5000.2-R (reference (c)), focuses on MDAPs, MAIS acquisition programs, and other programs as specifically identified, and describes more detailed mandatory procedures necessary for the effective operation of the defense acquisition system.

C. DEFINITIONS

1. Acquisition Executive. The individual, within the Department and Components, charged with overall acquisition management responsibilities within his or her respective organizations. The Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology (A&T)) is the Defense Acquisition Executive (DAE) responsible for all acquisition matters within the Department of Defense. The Component Acquisition Executives (CAEs) for each of the Components are the Secretaries of the Military Departments or Heads of Agencies with power of redelegation. The CAEs, or designee, are responsible for all acquisition matters within their respective Components.

2. Acquisition Phase. All the tasks and activities needed to bring a program to the next major milestone occur during an acquisition phase. Phases provide a logical means of progressively translating broadly stated mission needs into well defined system-specific requirements and ultimately into operationally effective, suitable, and survivable systems. An example of an acquisition phase is Program Definition and Risk Reduction.

3. Acquisition Program. A directed, funded effort that is designed to provide a new, improved, or continuing weapons system or automated information system (AIS) capability in response to a validated operational need. Acquisition programs are divided into categories, which are established to facilitate decentralized decision-making and execution and compliance with statutory requirements.

4. Automated Information System (AIS). A combination of computer hardware and software, data, or telecommunications, that performs functions such as collecting, processing, transmitting, and displaying information. Excluded are computer resources, both hardware

and software, that are: physically part of, dedicated to, or essential in real time to the mission performance of weapon systems.

5. Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Acquisition Program. An AIS acquisition program that is (1) designated by ASD(C3I) as a MAIS, or (2) estimated to require program costs in any single year in excess of 30 million in fiscal year (FY) 1996 constant dollars, total program costs in excess of 120 million in FY 1996 constant dollars, or total life-cycle costs in excess of 360 million in FY 1996 constant dollars. MAIS Acquisition Programs do not include highly sensitive classified programs (as determined by the Secretary of Defense). For the purpose of determining whether an AIS is a MAIS, the following shall be aggregated and considered a single AIS: (1) the separate AISs that constitute a multi-element program; (2) the separate AISs that make up an evolutionary or incrementally developed program; or (3) the separate AISs that make up an a multi-component AIS program.

6. Major Defense Acquisition Program (MDAP) An acquisition program that is not a highly sensitive classified program (as determined by the Secretary of Defense) and that is: (1) designated by the USD(A&T) as an MDAP, or (2) estimated by the USD(A&T) to require an eventual total expenditure for research, development, test and evaluation of more than 355 million in FY 1996 constant dollars or, for procurement, of more than 2.135 billion in FY 1996 constant dollars (10 USC §2430, reference (f)).

7. Major Milestones. A major milestone is the decision point that separates the phases of an acquisition program. MDAP milestones include, for example, the decisions to authorize entry into the engineering and manufacturing development phase, or to begin full-rate production. MAIS milestones may include, for example, the decision to begin program definition and risk reduction.

8. Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) The individual designated in accordance with criteria established by DoD 5000.2-R (reference (c)) to approve entry of an acquisition program into the next phase.

9. OSD Principal Staff Assistants (PSAs). The PSAs represent the user community in the functional area under their direction on acquisition and requirements matters. The OSD PSAs are the Under Secretaries of Defense (USDs), the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E), the Assistant Secretaries of Defense (ASDs), the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E), the General Counsel of the Department of Defense (GC, DoD), the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (IG, DoD), the Assistants to the Secretary of Defense (ATSDs), and the OSD Directors or equivalents, who report directly to the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

D. POLICY

The primary objective of the defense acquisition system is to acquire quality products that satisfy the needs of the operational user with measurable improvements to mission accomplishment, in a timely manner, at a fair and reasonable price. Successful acquisition programs are fundamentally dependent upon competent people, rational priorities, and clearly defined responsibilities. The following policies and principles govern the operation of the defense acquisition system and are divided into three major categories: (1) Translating Operational Needs into Stable, Affordable Programs, (2) Acquiring Quality Products, and (3)

Organizing for Efficiency and Effectiveness. These principles shall guide all defense acquisition programs:

1. TRANSLATING OPERATIONAL NEEDS INTO STABLE, AFFORDABLE PROGRAMS

a. Integrated Management Framework The policies stated herein are intended to forge a close and effective interface among the Department's three principal decision support systems: 1) the Requirements Generation System, 2) the Acquisition Management System, and 3) the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System. The requirements generation system, governed by CJCS MOP 77 (reference (g)), produces information for decision-makers on projected mission needs for MDAPs and MAISs, with missions requiring interface to the joint warfighter. The DoDD 8000.1 (reference (e)) provides complementary guidance for MAIS functional areas. The acquisition management system governed by this Directive provides for a streamlined management structure and event-driven management process that emphasizes risk management and affordability and that explicitly links milestone decisions to demonstrated accomplishments. The planning, programming, and budgeting system, governed by DoDD 7045.14 (reference (h)), provides the basis for making informed affordability assessments and resource allocation decisions on defense acquisition programs. All three systems operate continuously and concurrently to assist the Secretary of Defense and other senior officials in making critical decisions. The information derived from these systems permits senior DoD officials to plan for the future, allocate resources to meet the highest national priorities, and execute the current budget. The interaction of these systems enables the United States to acquire the quality products needed by the nation's Armed Forces.

b. Integrated Product and Process Development (IPPD) PMs and other acquisition managers shall apply the concept of IPPD throughout the acquisition process to the maximum extent practicable. IPPD is a management technique that integrates all acquisition activities starting with requirements definition through production, fielding/deployment and operational support in order to optimize the design, manufacturing, business, and supportability processes. At the core of IPPD implementation are Integrated Product Teams (IPTs).

c. Program Stability. Once DoD initiates an acquisition program to meet an operational need, managers at all levels shall make program stability a top priority. To maximize stability, the Components shall develop realistic long-range investment plans and affordability assessments. The Department's leadership shall strive to ensure stable program funding throughout the program's life-cycle.

d. Risk Assessment and Management PMs and other acquisition managers shall continually assess program risks. Risks must be well understood, and risk management approaches developed, before decision authorities can authorize a program to proceed into the next phase of the acquisition process. To assess and manage risk, PMs and other acquisition managers shall use a variety of techniques, including technology demonstrations, prototyping, and test and evaluation. Risk management encompasses identification, mitigation, and continuous tracking, and control procedures that feed back through the program assessment process to decision authorities. To ensure an equitable and sensible allocation of risk between government and industry, PMs and other acquisition managers shall develop a contracting approach appropriate to the type of system being acquired.

e. Total System Approach. Acquisition programs shall be managed to optimize total system performance and minimize the cost of ownership. The total system includes not just the prime mission equipment, but the people who operate and maintain the system; how systems security procedures and practices are implemented; how the system operates in its intended operational environment and how the system will be able to respond to any effects unique to that environment (such as Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) or information warfare); how the system will be deployed to this environment; the system's compatibility, interoperability, and integration with other systems; the operational and support infrastructure (including Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence (C4I)); training and training devices; any data required by the system in order for it to operate; and the system's potential impact on the environment and environmental compliance.

f. Cost as an Independent Variable (CAIV) Fiscal constraint is a reality that all participants in the defense acquisition process must recognize. Cost must be viewed as an independent variable. Accordingly, acquisition managers shall establish aggressive but realistic objectives for all programs and follow through by trading off performance and schedule, beginning early in the program (when the majority of costs are determined), to achieve a balanced set of goals, based on guidance from the MDA.

g. Program Objectives and Thresholds. Beginning at the inception of a new acquisition program, the PM, together with the user, shall propose for MDA approval objectives and thresholds for cost, schedule, and performance, that will result in systems that are affordable, timely, operationally effective, operationally suitable, and survivable. The PM shall refine these objectives and thresholds as the program matures, consistent with operational requirements.

h. Non-Traditional Acquisition. The Department must be prepared to plan and execute a diverse variety of missions. To meet the user's needs in a timely manner, the acquisition system must be able to rapidly insert advanced technology directly into the warfighter's arsenal. Doing so means being able to demonstrate new and improved military capabilities on a scale adequate to establish operational utility and affordable cost. Demonstrations based on mature technologies may lead to more rapid fielding. Where appropriate, managers in the acquisition community shall make use of non-traditional acquisition techniques, such as Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations (ACTDs), rapid prototyping, evolutionary and incremental acquisition, and flexible technology insertion.

i. Performance Specification. In solicitations and contracts, standard management approaches or manufacturing processes shall not be required. Performance specifications shall be used when purchasing new systems, major modifications, and commercial and nondevelopmental items. Performance specifications include DoD performance specifications, commercial item descriptions, and performance-based nongovernment standards. If it is not practicable to use a performance specification, a nongovernment standard shall be used. There may be cases when military specifications are needed to define an exact design solution because there is no acceptable nongovernment standard or because the use of a performance specification or nongovernment standard is not cost-effective, not practical, or does not meet the user's needs. In these cases, the use of military specifications and standards is authorized as a last resort, with an appropriate waiver or exception from the MDA.

2. ACQUIRING QUALITY PRODUCTS

a. Event-Oriented Management. The Department shall use a rigorous, event-oriented management process that emphasizes effective acquisition planning, improved and continuous communications with users, and prudent risk management by both the government and industry. Event-oriented means that the management process shall be based on significant events in the acquisition life-cycle and not arbitrary calendar dates.

b. Hierarchy of Materiel Alternatives. In response to operational requirements, priority consideration shall always be given to the most cost-effective solution over the system's life-cycle. Generally, use or modification of systems or equipment that the Department already owns is more cost-effective than acquiring new materiel. If existing U.S. military systems or other on-hand materiel cannot be economically used or modified to meet the operational requirement, an acquisition program may be justified and acquisition decision-makers shall observe the following hierarchy of alternatives: (1) the procurement (including modification) of commercially available systems or equipment, the additional production (including modification) of already-developed U.S. military systems or equipment, or Allied systems or equipment; (2) cooperative development program with one or more Allied nations; (3) new joint Service development program; and (4) a new Service-unique development program. Important in this evaluation process for new or modified systems are considerations for compatibility, interoperability, and integration with existing and future components or systems.

c. Communications with Users. The defense acquisition community shall maintain continuous and effective communications with the operational user. The objective is to gain a sound understanding of user needs and to work with the user to achieve a proper balance among cost, schedule, and performance considerations.

d. Competition. Competition provides major incentives to industry to enhance the application of advanced technology and life-cycle cost advantages to defense programs, as well as a mechanism to obtain an advantageous price. DoD Components shall acquire systems, subsystems, equipment, supplies and services in accordance with the statutory requirements for competition (10 USC §2304, reference (i)).

e. Test and Evaluation. Test and evaluation programs shall be structured to provide essential information to decision-makers, assess attainment of technical performance parameters, and determine whether systems are operationally effective, suitable, and survivable for intended use. Each Military Department shall establish an independent operational test and evaluation activity, reporting directly to the Service Chief, to plan and conduct operational tests, report results, and provide evaluations of effectiveness and suitability.

f. Modeling and Simulation. Models and simulations shall be used to reduce the time, resources, and risks of the acquisition process and to increase the quality of the systems being acquired. Representations of proposed systems (virtual prototypes) shall be embedded in realistic, synthetic environments to support the various phases of the acquisition process, from requirements determination and initial concept exploration to the manufacturing and testing of new systems, and related training.

g. Independent Assessments. Assessments, independent of the developer and the user, are extremely important to ensure an impartial evaluation of program status. Consistent with statutory requirements and good management practice, DoD shall use independent assessments of program status. Senior acquisition officials shall consider these assessments when making decisions. Staff offices that provide independent assessments shall support the orderly progression of programs through the acquisition process. Independent assessments shall be shared with the Integrated Product Team so that there is a full and open discussion of issues with no secrets.

h. Innovative Practices. The Department encourages PMs to continually search for innovative practices that reduce cycle time, reduce cost, and encourage teamwork.

i. Continuous Improvement. The Department shall continuously focus on implementing major improvements necessary to streamline the acquisition process, reduce infrastructure, and enhance customer service through process reengineering and technological breakthrough. Through a commitment to reengineering, the Department shall increase its ability to fund warfighting requirements and continued research and development.

j. Legality of Weapons Under International Law. DoD acquisition and procurement of weapons shall be consistent with all applicable treaties, customary international law, and the law of armed conflict (also known as the laws and customs of war). The Head of each DoD Component shall ensure that all Component activities that could reasonably generate questions concerning compliance with obligations under arms control agreements to which the United States is a party shall have clearance from the USD(A&T), in coordination with the OSD General Counsel and the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), before such activity is undertaken. The Head of each DoD Component shall ensure that the Component's General Counsel or Judge Advocate General, as appropriate, conducts a legal review of the intended acquisition of a potential weapon to determine that it is consistent with U.S. obligations. The review shall be conducted before the award of the engineering and manufacturing development contract and before the award of the initial production contract. Files shall be kept permanently. Additionally, legal reviews of new, advanced or emerging technologies which may lead to development of weapons or weapons systems are encouraged.

k. Software-Intensive Systems. Software is a key element in DoD systems. It is critical that software developers have a successful past performance record, experience in the software domain or product line, a mature software development process, and evidence of use and adequate training in software methodologies, tools, and environments.

l. Environmental Management. It is DoD policy to prevent, mitigate, or remediate environmental damage caused by acquisition programs. Prudent investments in pollution prevention can reduce life-cycle environmental costs and liability while improving environmental quality and program performance. In designing, manufacturing, testing, operating and disposing of systems, all forms of pollution shall be prevented or reduced at the source whenever feasible.

3. ORGANIZING FOR EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

a. Streamlined Organizations. DoD shall use a streamlined acquisition management structure characterized by short, clearly defined lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability. In general, the chain of command shall include the PM, the Program Executive

Officer (PEO), the Component Acquisition Executive (CAE), reporting through the Head of the Component, and the USD(A&T) or ASD(C3I). In all cases, no more than two levels of review shall exist between a PM and the MDA.

b. Acquisition Corps. The DoD acquisition workforce shall be fully proficient in the acquisition process. To ensure proficiency, and in accordance with the statutory requirements contained in 10 USC §1701 (reference (j)), the USD(A&T) shall establish education, training, and experience standards for each acquisition position based on the level of complexity of duties carried out in that position. These standards are contained in DoDD 5000.52 (reference (k)).

c. Teamwork. Defense acquisition works best when all of the Department's Components work together. Cooperation and empowerment are essential. The Department's acquisition community shall implement the concepts of Integrated Product and Process Development (IPPD) and Integrated Product Teams (IPTs) as extensively as possible.

d. Limited Reporting Requirements. Complete and up-to-date program information is an essential ingredient of the defense acquisition process. At the same time, it is important to keep reporting requirements to a minimum. Consistent with statutory requirements, PMs and other participants in the defense acquisition process shall be required to present only the minimum information necessary for decision authorities to understand program status and make informed decisions. The exchange of program information shall be facilitated by the use of IPTs.

e. Tailoring. Certain core issues must be addressed at the appropriate milestone for every acquisition program. These issues are described in detail in the major sections of DoD 5000.2-R (reference (c)) and include program definition, program structure, program design, program assessments, and periodic reporting. How these issues are addressed shall be tailored by the appropriate MDA to minimize the time it takes to satisfy an identified need consistent with common sense, sound business management practice, applicable laws and regulations, and the time sensitive nature of the requirement itself. Tailoring may be applied to various aspects of the acquisition process, including program documentation, acquisition phases, the timing and scope of decision reviews, and decision levels. MDAs shall promote flexible, tailored approaches to oversight and review based on mutual trust and a program's size, risk, and complexity.

f. Automated Acquisition Information (AAI). The Department shall maintain an automated acquisition information (AAI) infrastructure to provide current and comprehensive information to decision-makers and interested parties, and to give PMs access to management tools that facilitate efficient and effective acquisition. The Defense Acquisition Deskbook satisfies the requirement for an AAI infrastructure. The Defense Acquisition Deskbook is an automated repository of information that consists of an electronic Desk Reference Set, a Tool Catalog, and a Forum for the exchange of information. The Reference Set organizes information into two main categories: mandatory guidance and discretionary information.

g. Management Control. Rigorous internal management control systems are integral to effective and accountable program management. The objective is to perform acquisition functions efficiently and effectively while maximizing the utilization and protection of resources through internal management controls. Managers throughout the acquisition community should implement appropriate management controls in accordance with this Directive and DoD

5000.2-R (reference (c)) (both of which satisfy the requirements of DoDD 5010.38 (reference (l)). Control objectives for acquisition program cost, schedule, and performance parameters are embodied in Acquisition Program Baselines (APBs). Material weaknesses are identified through deviations from approved APB parameters and exit criteria, as reflected in the DAES. In implementing internal management control systems, managers shall focus on results, not process.

E. RESPONSIBILITIES

This section describes the responsibilities of key acquisition officials and key forums. A key official is a DoD official who is: a member of the streamlined acquisition chain of command or a member of the Defense Acquisition Board. This section is descriptive only. Official responsibilities and authorities are set forth in individual DoD Directives and Component documents for each official and some forums.

1. Key Officials

a. The Deputy Secretary of Defense approves funding for new acquisition programs and provides general affordability planning guidance for use in structuring these programs, and leads the Defense Resources Board (DRB) (10 USC §132 (reference (m)).

b. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)) is the Department's Acquisition Executive for MDAPs. As such, the USD(A&T) establishes acquisition policies and procedures, and chairs the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) (10 USC §133 (reference (n)), DoDD 5134.1 (reference (o)).

c. The Under Secretary of Defense (Policy) (USD(P)) leads the Department's planning effort (10 USC §134 (reference (p)), DoDD 5111.1 (reference (q)).

d. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) (USD(C)) leads the Department's budgeting effort (10 USC §135 (reference (r)), DoDD 5118.3 (reference (s)).

e. The Secretary of each Military Department, and the Heads of other DoD Components having acquisition management responsibilities, ensure that policies and procedures governing the operation of the Department's acquisition, requirements, and budgeting systems are effectively implemented. Each Secretary and Component Head also designates a single, full-time Acquisition Executive at the Assistant Secretary (or equivalent) level known as the Component Acquisition Executive (CAE), selects PEOs, establishes a centralized system for selecting PMs, and charters a Component-level system of acquisition oversight and review.

f. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS) chairs the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), vice-chairs the DAB, and represents the Commanders-in-Chiefs of the Unified Combatant Commands on acquisition and requirements matters (10 USC §154 (reference (t)).

g. The Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) establishes Department policies and procedures for operational test and evaluation and live-fire test and evaluation (10 USC §139 (reference(u)), DoDD 5141.2 (reference (v)).

h. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (ASD(C3I)) is the Department's Chief Information Officer (CIO) (formerly the Senior IM Official). As such, the ASD(C3I) is the Department's Acquisition Executive for AISs; establishes acquisition policies and procedures unique to AISs, and chairs the MAISRC (10 USC §138 (reference (w)); DoDD 5137.1 (reference (x)).

i. The Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation (DPA&E) leads the Department's programming effort (DoDD 5141.1 (reference (y)), provides guidance for and reviews the results of analysis of alternatives studies prepared for acquisition programs, and for AIS systems determines that the cost and benefit analyses are accurate and complete.

j. The Component Acquisition Executives (CAEs) supervise the operation of the acquisition system within their respective Component and are responsible for enforcing policies established by the USD(A&T). CAEs also serve as decision authorities for assigned programs.

k. Program Executive Officers (PEOs) review and assess changes reported in assigned programs, the significance of the problems reported by the PM, the PM's proposed action plans, and the level of risk associated with such plans. PEOs also serve as decision authorities for assigned programs.

l. System Command (SYSCOM)/Designated Acquisition/Materiel Command Commanders provide support to PEOs and PMs and are decision authorities for assigned programs.

m. Program Managers (PMs) manage assigned programs in a manner consistent with the policies and principles articulated in this Directive and the PM Bill of Rights. In addition, PMs provide assessments of program status and risk to higher authorities and to the user or user's representative; actively manage, to the best of their abilities within approved resources, program cost, performance, and schedule; and provide assessments of contractor performance.

n. OIPT Leaders provide strategic guidance to the program office, resolve issues, and provide an independent assessment to the USD(A&T) and the DAB at major decision points, using information gathered through the Integrated Product Team (IPT) process.

2. Key Forums

a. The Defense Resources Board (DRB) is the senior DoD resource allocation board chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense. The DRB advises the Deputy Secretary on major resource allocation decisions.

b. The Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) is the senior DoD acquisition review board chaired by the USD(A&T). The DAB advises the USD(A&T) on major decisions on individual acquisition programs, specifically, and acquisition policies and procedures, generally.

c. The Major Automated Information System Review Council (MAISRC) is the senior DoD automated information systems acquisition review board chaired by the ASD(C3I). The MAISRC advises the ASD(C3I) on major decisions on individual major automated information system acquisition programs, specifically, and AIS acquisition policies and procedures, generally.

d. The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), chaired by the VCJCS, conducts requirements analyses, validates mission needs and key performance parameters, and develops recommended joint priorities for those needs. The JROC validates the C4I certification of mission need and operational requirements documents for conformance with joint C4 policy and doctrine, architectural integrity, and interoperability standards. The JROC advises the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) on requirements (MCM 14-95 (reference (z)).

e. Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG), chaired by the Deputy Director, Resource Analysis, PA&E, conducts reviews of DoD Component cost estimates and prepares the independent cost estimate (DoDD 5000.4 (reference (aa)).

f. The Integrated Product Team (IPT) is composed of representatives from all appropriate functional disciplines working together with a Team Leader to build successful and balanced programs, identify and resolve issues, and make sound and timely recommendations to facilitate decision-making. There are three types of IPTs: Overarching IPTs focus on strategic guidance, program assessment, and issue resolution. Working Level IPTs identify and resolve program issues, determine program status, and seek opportunities for acquisition reform. Program IPTs focus on program execution, and may include representatives from both government, and after contract award, industry.

F. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Directive is effective immediately.

Enclosure 1

REFERENCES (continued)

(e) DoD Directive 8000.1, "Defense Information Management (IM) Program," October 27, 1992
(f) Title 10, United States Code, Section 2430, Major defense acquisition program defined (these amounts have been increased pursuant to the statutory notice provided to Congress)
(g) Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) MOP 77, Requirements Generation System Policies and Procedures
(h) DoD Directive 7045.14, "Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS)," Change 1, May 22, 1984
(i) Title 10, United States Code, Section 2304, Contracts: competition requirements
(j) Title 10, United States Code, Section 1701, Management policies
(k) DoD Directive 5000.52, "Defense Acquisition Education, Training and Career Development Program," October 25, 1991
(l) DoD Directive 5010.38, "Internal Management Control Program," April 14, 1987
(m) Title 10, United States Code, Section 132, Deputy Secretary of Defense
(n) Title 10, United States Code, Section 133, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology
(o) DoD Directive 5134.1, "Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)," June 8, 1994
(p) Title 10, United States Code, Section 134, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy
(q) DoD Directive 5111.1, "Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P))," March 22, 1995
(r) Title 10, United States Code, Section 135, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
(s) DoD Directive 5118.3, "Comptroller of the Department of Defense (C, DoD)," June 24, 1991
(t) Title 10, United States Code, Section 154, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
(u) Title 10, United States Code, Section 139, Director of Operational Test and Evaluation
(v) DoD Directive 5141.2, "Director of Operational Test and Evaluation," Change 1, April 2, 1984
(w) Title 10, United States Code, Section 138, Assistant Secretaries of Defense
(x) DoD Directive 5137.1, "Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (ASD(C3I))," February 12, 1992
(y) DoD Directive 5141.1, "Assistant Secretary of Defense (Program Analysis and Evaluation)," February 1, 1989
(z) MCM 14-95, Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council
(aa) DoD Directive 5000.4, "OSD Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG)," Change 1, November 24, 1992

Enclosure 2

List of Cancellations Authorized by update of DoD Directive 5000.1

DoD Directives, Instructions, and Manuals

(bb) DoD Instruction 5000.2, "Defense Acquisition Management Policies and Procedures," February 23, 1991
(cc) DoD Directive 5000.49, "Defense Acquisition Board," September 11, 1989
(dd) DoD 7920.2-M, "Automated Information System Life-Cycle Management Manual," March 1990
(ee) DoD Instruction 7920.4, "Baselining of Automated Information Systems," March 21, 1988
(ff) DoD Instruction 8120.2, "Automated Information System Life-Cycle Management Process, Review, and Milestone Approval Procedures," January 14,1993
(gg) DoD 5000.2-M, "Defense Acquisition Management Documentation and Reports," February 23, 1991

Policy Memoranda

(hh) Office of the Secretary of Defense Memorandum, "Implementation Guidelines for Relating Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analysis (COEA) Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) to Test and Evaluation," March 9, 1992
(ii) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Foreign Military Sales of Major Defense Systems Which Have Not Completed Operational Test and Evaluation Satisfactorily," May 15, 1992
(jj) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "F-22 Exit Criteria" (last paragraph), May 20, 1993
(kk) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Long Leadtime Item Procurement," September 13, 1993
(ll) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Work Breakdown Structures," October 8, 1993
(mm) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Reporting of Program Modifications and Upgrades," October 14, 1993
(nn) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "ACAT I Notification," January 6, 1994
(oo) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Live Fire Test and Evaluation Guidelines," January 27, 1994
(pp) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Use of Commercial Quality System Standards in the Department of Defense," February 14, 1994
(qq) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "DoD Policy for Automatic Test Systems," April 29, 1994
(rr) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Request for Waiver to DoD Instruction 5000.2 (Part 2), Paragraph C2(f)," August 18, 1994
(ss) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Request for Waiver Cases #436 and #437," August 18, 1994
(tt) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, "Release to Contractors of Numerical Weights Used in Source Selections," August 22, 1994

(uu) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Tailoring of Acquisition Procedures and Documentation for Acquisition Category (ACAT) II, III, and IV Programs,” August 23, 1994
(vv) Office of the Secretary of Defense Memorandum, “Use of Ada,” August 26, 1994
(ww) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Integrated Program Management,” September 30, 1994
(xx) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Streamlined Acquisition Decision Memorandum Process,” December 15, 1994
(yy) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Defense Acquisition Environmental Policies and Procedures, DoDI 5000.2, Part 6, Section I,” December 30, 1994
(zz) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Operating and Support Costs in Acquisition Program Reviews,” March 15, 1995
(aaa) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Quantities to be Procured for Low Rate Initial Production,” April 14, 1995
(bbb) Secretary of Defense Memorandum, “Use of Integrated Product and Process Development and Integrated Product Teams in DoD Acquisition,” May 10, 1995
(ccc) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Competition in Acquisition of Defense Systems,” May 4, 1995
(ddd) Director Operational Test and Evaluation Memorandum, “Live Fire Test and Evaluation Authority and Responsibility, June 3, 1995
(eee) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Policy on Cost-Performance Trade-Offs,” July 19, 1995
(fff) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Technical Representatives at Contractor Facilities,” August 9, 1995
(ggg) Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Memorandum, “Acquisition Program Baselines and Performance Based Management of Defense Programs,” September 27, 1995